

DU 627

4

M6

024627
4
-m6

THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

I make no secret of saying for myself and for my constituents that I am in favor of enlarging our borders and annexing these friendly islands as a Territory to the dominion of the United States.

S P E E C H

OF

HON. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.,

OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1894.



2
6
5
2
4
0
6
7
1
2

WASHINGTON.

1894.

IIU 627
M6.4

121287
08

31

SPEECH
OF
HON. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.

The House having under consideration the resolution submitted by Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, condemning the action of the United States minister in employing the United States naval forces in overthrowing the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Islands, in January, 1893, and setting up in its place a Provisional Government; heartily approving the principle announced by the President that interference with the domestic affairs of an independent nation is contrary to the spirit of American institutions; that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to our country or the assumption of a protectorate over them by our Government is uncalled for and inexpedient; that the people of that country should have absolute freedom and independence in pursuing their line of policy, and that foreign intervention in the political affairs of the islands will not be regarded with indifference by the Government of the United States—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE said :

Mr. SPEAKER: I can not hope to add anything to the learned and exhaustive presentation of my view of this case made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] and my colleague [Mr. DRAPER], or the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR].

And but for the fact that Massachusetts has an especial and peculiar interest in the Hawaiian Islands I would remain silent. The first missionary to these islands was sent forth from Park Street Church, Boston, October 15, 1819.

The efforts that resulted in reclaiming these islands from barbarism, cannibalism, and heathenism of the most revolting and degrading form—I say these missionary efforts were born amid prayers and tears of godly men and women of the old Commonwealth I have in part the honor to represent.

I say men and women of Massachusetts heard and obeyed the words of the lowly Nazarene, "Go ye into all the world and

preach the gospel to every creature;" and in obedience to that command men and women left homes of refinement, ease, culture, and wealth, and crossed oceans to these far-off islands to tell the story of Jesus and how he died for sinners.

Joyfully these self-imposed exiles went forth singing—

Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
Doth successive journeys run;
His kingdom stretch from shore to shore
Till moons shall wax and wane no more.

I say they left home and native land, and society and friends, and endured privation, hardship, and danger untold, to tell these dusky sons and daughters of the Pacific of One who left His home in glory to tell them of "One who was rich, and who for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might be made rich."

Most of these pioneer missionaries have long since fallen asleep. They have long since gone to "see the King in His beauty," whose they were and whom they served. They have joined the blood-washed throng.

I asked them whence their victory came,
And with united breath
They ascribed their conquests to the Lamb,
Their victory to His death.

But, Mr. Speaker, their works do follow them—being dead, they yet speak.

The result of the service of these disinterested, self-sacrificing heralds of the cross—the result, I say, of these labors, in elevating, Christianizing, civilizing, and exalting a once degraded people is a part of the world's history and need not be recounted here.

Mr. Speaker, in the great day when the books are opened and the roll of the heroes and martyrs is called, among them will be the names of the early missionaries to the Sandwich Islands.

And among those who hear the words of Jesus in the great day, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me," will be recited the names of the godly men and women who stood by the staff at home, and with their prayers and money sustained the soldiers of the cross at the front in this far-off clime.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it pains the good people of the United

States who are conversant with the history I have here recited, that the attitude of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and his advisers should appear to be hostile and unfriendly to these men and women, many of whom are descended from the missionaries and are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois has well said that if these people have any fault it is a blind idolatry of their benefactors, the people of these United States, and especially of the people of Massachusetts, to whom they are well aware they owe their elevation in the scale of humanity and the redemption of those islands from heathenism and barbarism.

Mr. Speaker, I can not hope to add anything to the arraignment which has been made on this floor of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State as regards their conduct towards these people. The facts are familiar.

The Christian and intelligent people of the islands arose in mass and revolted against the government of a dissolute, immoral woman, who assumed to be the ruler. The revolt, according to all the testimony, was so unanimous and overwhelming that she and her advisers offered no resistance, but apparently at the time fully acquiesced in the change in the form of government.

It seems from the most reliable and undisputed testimony that the war ship Boston and our minister, Stevens, were at sea and absent from the island when the revolution took place.

President Harrison presented to the Senate of the United States a treaty annexing those islands to the great Republic. That treaty was hailed with loud acclaim from one end of this country to the other.

And the people of these United States, without regard to party affiliations, at the time of its submission ratified it by an overwhelming voice.

A canvass of the House and Senate by newspaper correspondents of the great metropolitan journals at the time showed that the Senate and House of Representatives responded to the popular demand, and that a majority of both Houses was in favor of the ratification of the treaty.

The treaty, as I understand it, did not contemplate statehood, but annexation as a Territory of the United States.

We need a coaling station in the Pacific certainly in time of war, but more in time of peace. We need a place where our commerce can not only get coal, but American supplies of all kinds without tribute or duty.

The people of the islands were anxious to be joined to their mother country; and the people of this country were anxious for the union, which would give us peaceful possession of so valuable a country, and add glory and fame to the greatest Republic of all history.

All the other great powers appeared to acquiesce in this mutual desire for union. At this point the Administration changes; Grover Cleveland withdraws the treaty submitted by Harrison before it can be acted upon by the Senate.

His next step is to send Mr. Blount there with "paramount" authority over the regularly appointed and elected representative of the Government, Mr. Stevens.

I have very great respect for Mr. Blount; I served with him during two Congresses in this House. He is a gentleman of high character and integrity; but, Mr. Speaker, he was not sent there to act the part of an impartial judge, but all the evidence goes to show that under his instructions he was sent there by the President as an advocate to establish a case.

The evidence goes to show that all his inquiries and investigations were bent on that line. He obeyed the orders of his master; he brought back the testimony he was ordered to bring.

He was succeeded by Minister Willis, who carried in one hand a letter from President Cleveland addressed to President Dole, as "my great and good friend," and in the other hand an order to recognize and reestablish the Queen on a rotten throne, from which her indignant subjects had expelled her.

So aptly likened by Senator HOAR, to Joab, who approached his brother with the inquiry "Art thou in health my brother?" and at the same time stabbed him under the fifth rib.

I know not what the motives of the Administration may have been in recalling the treaty submitted by President Harrison, and afterward in attempting to justify it by the testimony of Mr.

Blount; but of one thing I am fully assured, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in his arraignment of the Administration, in his charges of perfidy, dishonor, and dishonorable conduct toward the Provisional Government, has but spoken the sentiment of the country.

I can not find words to describe my disapproval of the conduct of the Administration in persisting in its purpose to restore this dissolute woman (who is said to have no less than three paramours) to the throne; especially is this conduct exceedingly repulsive and offensive to every right-minded citizen when it is known that Minister Willis was ordered to continue his efforts at restoration, and to demand the surrender of the Provisional Government to her after her bloodthirsty purpose to behead all her opponents, confiscate their property, and banish their families was known.

I quote here the following from a Massachusetts paper, that I think speaks the sentiment of the State. I send it to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All unbiased testimony from Honolulu is to the effect that the ex-Queen is a worthless, dissolute, and evil-minded creature, whose rule brought degradation and ruin upon her country. Her deposition, whether with or without the connivance of the American minister—and on this point the evidence is largely on Mr. Stevens's side—was hailed with thanksgiving by all the inhabitants of the islands who are intelligent enough to know the difference between a government of and for the people and a despotism that seeks the subversion of every principle of patriotism and every individual sense of honor and manliness. The spectacle of the President of the United States pleading for "justice" for this abandoned woman is enough to bring the blush of mortification to every honest cheek.—*Athol Transcript*.

Mr. Speaker, I make no secret of saying for myself and for my constituents I am in favor of enlarging our borders and annexing these friendly islands as a Territory to the dominion of the United States.

What would seem to be a wise policy for the Kingdom of Great Britain would seem to some extent to be a wise policy for us; she has surrounded us with her possessions, with islands, coaling, and supply stations.

As I have before stated, we need such a station in the Pacific Ocean. And I shall cast my vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR].

The following able article in the Rockland (Mass.) Standard, from the pen of Rev. Jesse H. Jones, of North Abington, is germane to this discussion:

Public discussion in the press generally and in Congress has brought out clearly to view in detail the wrongdoings in the course which President Cleveland has pursued concerning Hawaii, and an abstract of the points made may be interesting:

First. He violated the constitutional law of the land, and assumed to himself wholly powers which he shares only with others. For instance:

1. He had no right to assume that it was his business to right any wrong that may have been done to the Government of Hawaii by the United States minister there, even if it was certain that a wrong had been done; for that minister is the representative of the whole Government of the United States, and not a part. That whole Government is the President and Congress, especially the Senate, and it was the business of the whole Government to right the wrong, and not a part of it—the President. His whole attitude of mind and course of conduct from the time when he began his investigation to that when he made his offer of restoration to the deposed Queen was illegal, unconstitutional, a violation of the fundamental principles of this Government. He assumed that he was the Government, that the responsibility of action rested on him only, whereas it rested on him and the Senate together.

2. The above will appear further when we note that he had no right to appoint Mr. Blount as he did with "paramount authority;" that Mr. Blount was not an officer of the United States at all; that he had no standing in law whatsoever; that the Provisional Government had the perfect right to have hustled him off from their territory the moment he landed; that he had no right to order the United States officers there to perform any act; that he had no right of defense as an officer of the United States, for he was not one; that he was only the President's private hired man, with the rights of a private citizen of this nation, having come under the Government of Hawaii.

This will appear more plainly when we call to mind the legal status of Mr. Stevens. He was the legal representative of our Government, appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate; and it takes the two actions to make a minister plenipotentiary or chargé d'affaires to a foreign government. President Cleveland had the right to remove him instantly, on taking the oath of office, but as long as he did not remove him he had no right to appoint another over him. So his appointment giving Mr. Blount "paramount authority" was literally empty wind, wholly illegal—an action which deserved all the ridicule that has been heaped upon it, for it implied a revolution in our Government, and the transformation of the President into an irresponsible czar.

Now, all this and much more that I might write, is true, no matter how good the intentions of the President were, and I believe that he had good intentions, but he, apparently, did not know how to carry them out in a constitutional manner. Had he removed Mr. Stevens, appointed a new minister, asked the Senate for a committee of investigation, when it reported sent a message to the Senate, asked for and secured its coördinate action, and then had done what he thus by law was authorized to do, he would not have trampled the Constitution and laws of his own country under his feet, as he did do, in trying to right in his own view the wrongs done to another government.

Second. The method which he took to get at the facts was one unworthy

the confidence of an intelligent people. He sent one man, a strong partisan of his, instead of three, in which both parties should be represented. That partisan conducted a partisan investigation, which had in it some elements of the sneak, arrived at a result right opposite to that stated by Mr. Stevens, who was right on the ground at the time and much more likely to know. An issue of personal veracity is raised between Mr. Blount and Mr. Stevens, and the most moderate judgment is that they neutralize each other so that the public can not decide.

But President Cleveland accepts the report of his agent and proceeds on his own responsibility to offer to the deposed Queen to try to put her back on her throne, an act which he had no more right to do than he had to declare war against Great Britain. Only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" could such an action lawfully be done. Restoring deposed queens is no part of the lawful duties of the President of the United States.

Third. His secret instructions to Minister Willis and the whole course of conduct outlined thereby are such an outrage upon international comity as to constitute a public crime.

The following article from the pen of Anvill Sparks, of Natick, Mass., is a testimony to the truth of what I have said of the early history and rescue of these people from paganism by citizens of my State—as well as a testimony to the power of the Gospel to civilize and elevate:

Our present interest begins with the Hawaiian Islands as a missionary station. The first missionaries to Hawaii were sent forth to their work from the Park Street Church, Boston, October 15, 1819. One month after their embarkation, idolatry and the cruel system of *tabu* in the Islands were abolished by the joint act of both high priest and King, so that when they arrived there, five months afterwards, they found these isles literally "waiting for God's law;" and on the first Sunday morning following Hiram Bingham took this for his text when he preached on board the brig *Thadæus*, while the natives were gathered on the shore waiting for his word.

Since that day, up to 1879, 40 ordained missionaries, 83 female missionaries, 26 lay teachers, and 6 physicians had been sent to these islands by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the people of the United States had contributed considerably more than a million dollars to the support of this mission.

With what results let the statistics of 1886 answer: Fifty-six Protestant churches formed, to which had been added 67,000 members. Moving concurrently with this, the common schools, the translation, publication, and spread of the Bible and a large amount of educational and Christian literature.

Writing only a few years later, Rev. Dr. Anderson says: "The education of the islands is now (1870) sustained wholly by the island community, native and foreign. The Government expenditure for common schools in 1869 under direction of the board of education was \$38,865. Add to this \$3,929 for common-school houses and \$2,625 for school books, and the sum is \$45,419. The additional expenditure in the same year for what are called Hawaiian English schools, in which the English language is more or less supplemented by the Hawaiian, was \$29,128; raising the grand total of the expenditure of the Government for education in 1869 to \$74,547. The pupils of the better class were about 1,500. In the common schools the attendance was 5,918, of whom 3,427 were boys and 2,511 were girls. Somewhat over 100 adult children of mis-

sionaries are (1870) resident on the islands. They are all Hawaiian citizens."

George L. Chaney, after spending some three years on the islands with every opportunity for observing the progress and character of the people and their social, political, and religious advancement, published a little volume entitled "Aloha," on his return to the States in 1876, in which he says: "Is it not enough to justify and glorify all that has been done for them, that in half a century they have risen from superstition, war, and ignorance to a condition of peace among themselves and with all mankind, freedom from idolatry, general comfort, and the nearest approach to universal education known among any people? Nearly every adult native upon the islands can read and write."

To show that the love of education has taken deep root among the natives of the islands, it may surprise many to know that these "pagans" (?) are well enough advanced to appreciate and support a daily paper in their midst, the Hawaiian Holomua, that in high moral tone would put to shame any one of our Boston dailies.

Even going back in Hawaiian history to thirty-six years ago, we find the missionaries saying in their "Annual Mission Letter" of 1857:

"Our towns are rising; our roads are improving; agriculture and industry are assuming increasing importance. Our Government in its legislative, executive, and judiciary departments has acquired organic form and is moving on in the discharge of its functions. Our schools are sustained; our islands are being dotted over with improved church edifices. Law is supreme; order prevails; protection of all human rights is nearly complete. There is little complaining or suffering in the land and shocking crimes are rare; it may be doubted whether the sun shines on a more peaceful people."

Farther back still, in 1853, Chief Justice Lee, in his report to the Hawaiian Government, bears this testimony:

"In no part of the world are life and property more safe than in the Sandwich Islands. Murders, robberies, and the higher class of felonies are quite unknown here, and in city or country we retire to our sleep conscious of the most entire security. The stranger may travel from one end of the group to the other, over mountains and through woods, sleeping in grass huts unarmed, alone, and unprotected, with any amount of treasures on his person, and with a tithe of the vigilance required in older and more civilized countries, go unrobbed of a penny."

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder these people love our country and desire to come under our flag?

The following from a recent address of Mr. William B. Oleson before the Congregational Club of Boston I think is sound and wise, and will justify my vote for Mr. BLAIR'S amendment:

The situation is so peculiar as to call for the fostering supervision of some strong foreign power under which it would be possible for an efficient and progressive government to grow up, advantageous alike to Hawaii and the commercial and humanitarian interests of that vast ocean.

Such a protective relation the United States has officially declared it will not permit any other nation to assume toward Hawaii. The progress of events demonstrates that sooner or later foreign intervention from some quarter is inevitable. If the United States insists that no other nation shall assume the responsibility of guaranteeing in Hawaii the blessings of civilized government, that responsibility the United States is morally bound to accept itself.

There can be no question but all the Christian and intelligent people of these islands sustain the new Government and are against the Queen. Shall we cast our influence in favor of paganism or in favor of civilization and Christianity? Mr. Speaker, I submit that in annexation there is glory, and safety, and honor for our country; in delay there is danger of great and irreparable loss, and perchance foreign complication, and perhaps bloodshed and war in the future.

But whatever views gentleman may take of the question of annexation, there ought to be no difference of opinion, and I believe there is none on the Republican side of this House, about the unpatriotic and unjust conduct of President Cleveland and Secretary Gresham toward the Provisional Government.

And surely we can not and we will not do less than to recognize the Provisional Government as the government *de jure* and the government *de facto*. Annexation is doubtless impossible while Grover Cleveland is President. And my counsel to the good people of those islands is to organize a republican form of government, with an educational qualification for citizenship, and abide their time until the times and seasons have changed, until the voice of the people of the United States can again be heard in a national election three years hence.

The people of this country can be depended upon to repudiate Grover Cleveland and Secretary Gresham with their economic and foreign policy, and substitute for those men Republican statesmen, not gangrened by prejudice or moved by jealousy in the conduct of foreign affairs and public business. Indeed the country has already repudiated him and his policy, and at the election last November, before his Sandwich Island policy was fully developed, the country buried the Democratic party out of sight in the great empire States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, and Massachusetts.

I say to the people of the Sandwich Islands, be of good cheer, the people of the United States are at present misrepresented by Grover Cleveland. I believe that three years hence we will welcome them with loud acclaim as a part of the greatest republic of all history.

Monday, February 4, 1894.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for two minutes and a half.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in that brief time there is one remark which I did not have time to make when my time expired and which I desire to add to my speech of Saturday evening. For the last twenty-five years, since the days of reconstruction began, after the close of the war the "shibboleth" in the South, the political war cry that has downed all opposition, that has downed the Republicans, the Populists, and all other parties, and that has made the South invariably come up of late years with a solid Democratic delegation in Congress, has been the cry "a white man's government."

Now let us hear no more about a white man's government. On the one side of this controversy is a dissolute colored female. She has none, utterly none, of the glamour which attaches to royalty and to persons of noble birth. Her father was a colored barber. On the other side, contending for the right to rule these islands, are not only white men and women, but nearly or quite all the virtuous and intelligent white people of the islands. And yet, strange to tell, at the command of their master, Grover Cleveland, his supporters in the House and in the Senate, staunch Southern Democrats, the loudest shouters for a "white man's government," disregard all of their ancient traditions about white supremacy and the white man's government.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I call the gentleman to order, and demand that his words be taken down; those in which insulting and impudent language is addressed to members of this side of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the language of the gentleman complained of.

The Clerk read as follows:

On the other side are not only white men and women, but nearly or quite all of the virtuous and intelligent white people of the islands. And yet strange to tell at the command of their master, the great Grover Cleveland, the cuckoos in the House and in the Senate, staunch Southern Democrats—

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The language to which I except is that which speaks of members of the House and the President——

Mr. BURROWS. It is for the Chair to pass on the language.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I simply wanted the Chair to know the part to which I called attention as out of order.

Mr. COGSWELL. When exception is taken to words spoken in debate the rules prescribe that the words be taken down, as has been done in this case; they do not prescribe that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] shall comment on the language before it has been ruled upon by the Chair.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] will permit me to say that I was not commenting on the language. I was merely calling attention to the words to which I objected. I did not propose to comment on the language.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the language parliamentary. The Chair does not think that any gentleman on the floor of the House has the right to speak of members of the House and Senate as being controlled by "their master," the President. He does not think that language parliamentary.

Mr. MORSE. Well, I will recall so much as is unparliamentary. I bow with entire respect to the ruling of the Chair. I withdraw the words, "at the command of their master," to which the Speaker objects.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] has expired.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. LACEY. I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I desire first to say a single word in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] who this morning called me to order for unparliamentary language. I think if he will examine the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will find that what I said was mild, tame, and insipid compared with some utterances from his own side as applied to this side during

the recent tariff debate. Take the speech of Mr. CLARK of Missouri as an illustration, which all who heard it will recall, in which he referred to the Republican side as "hell."

[On page 1906 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 1, will be found the following:

Mr. MORSE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly, with delight. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said awhile ago that when a man entered this House by the main door and walked down the main aisle and turned to the right, he was in hell; and I want to know whether the gentleman included in that description the "Cherokee Strip" over here?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, sir. The Cherokee Strippers, who are Democrats, were forced by circumstances into close proximity to the protectionist hell.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly heard the great manufacturers and business men of Massachusetts—and they include some men on this floor—I say I have heard these men frequently denounced as "Shylocks," "robber barons," "extortioners," "gold bugs," etc.

In view of these utterances, I submit that any charge of unparliamentary language comes with a bad grace from the Democratic side of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the uncompleted sentence of my speech, which was hung up like Mahomet's coffin when my time expired, and which I desire to complete and add to my speech of Saturday evening, was the following:

The Democratic party on this floor has denounced Minister Stevens and President Harrison for taking sides, not only with the white man's government, but with a government of intelligence, virtue, and decency, and for siding against royalty, in harmony with all our practice and traditions from our earliest history. I say after this let us hear no more against negro rule and a white man's government, the Democratic party having here and now indorsed the former as against the latter, for Hawaii at least.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that were an election to be held next week, my State would repudiate Grover Cleveland and his economic and foreign policy by 100,000 majority. I tell you that the Democrats of the North are disgusted. They do not believe in "Populist," "Socialist," and "free-trade" leadership. Many Democratic papers have denounced Mr. Cleveland's foreign policy, and every Democratic paper in my State, so far as I know, has denounced the odious, inquisitorial "income tax." They do not like to hear her great business men, manufacturers, and merchants called the names to which I have referred—"Shylocks," "robber barons," "extortioners," such as has been the case frequently in the tariff debate just closed.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I will if I have the time.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I want to know if you indorse the foreign policy of President Harrison?

Mr. MORSE. I most heartily do.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Do you indorse that foreign policy of his which took a savage king named Malietoa and put him back on his throne within the first three months after Mr. Harrison was inaugurated President of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. I am not as familiar with the Samoa matter as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, but so far as I know I indorse President Harrison's foreign policy. I indorse President Harrison's foreign policy fully, as relates to the Chilean complication, in which he displayed the finest statesmanship; in relation to the troubles with Italy over the New Orleans affair, avoiding war and maintaining the dignity and honor of the country; and last but not least, his masterly Bering Sea arbitration, avoiding war and making a long stride toward settling all national disputes by arbitration. President Harrison's foreign policy and diplomacy was honorable to himself and reflected glory and honor upon his Administration and upon his country.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 944 338 0



THE NEWLY CROWNED KING OF THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.
[FROM A PHOTOGRAPH BY WHIPPLE, OF BOSTON.]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 944 338 0

